

**QUESTIONS FOR  
DR. HERZ, PROBATION OUTCOMES STUDY WORK GROUP  
JULY 6, 2016**

- 1) The Outcomes Study recommends effective cross-departmental collaboration to ensure availability of support services for Probation youth and families both while in custody and communities post-release. How, in your opinion, might an effective oversight body monitor such collaboration on an ongoing basis?
- 2) Do you or other members of your work group interact with the Probation Commission, or other entities charged with providing formal or informal oversight over the Probation Department?
- 3) Have any of your recommendations from the Outcomes Study or your current work with the Work Group led to policy or programmatic changes in LA County (in addition to the creation of your Work Group)? Please provide any specific examples.
- 4) Do you receive any ongoing feedback regarding your recommendations, including any corrective action taken? If so, is this feedback shared with any of the existing Probation oversight commissions or entities?
- 5) Based on your research and findings, how many youth do you consider to be currently under 236 supervision?
- 6) The 236 cases are kept in a unique “database” (or tracked separately from other cases located in PCMS and JAI). Do you have access to data for these cases? The outcomes study recommends a Juvenile Justice Data Systems Task Force to review current data systems and make short and long term recommendations to develop an integrated County youth data system. Would you recommend inclusion of the 236 cases in this youth data system?
- 7) Based on your research and findings, how many youth are currently under “active investigation?” Do you have a break-down of how many youth under “active investigation” are 654 cases, and how many are 725 cases? Have you done any research into the use pre-plea reports in lieu of pre-dispo reports in Los Angeles County, and effect(s) of this practice?
- 8) If implemented, would the integrated County youth data system make data available for longitudinal studies of Probation practices?
- 9) Do you think having Probation and Probation sub-contractors directly involved in the evaluation and oversight of the Department presents a conflict in any way? Is it important to have “outside data” and evaluators involved in oversight? Please explain.

- 10) How, in your opinion and based on your research and expertise, might oversight over the Probation Department be strengthened? Please share any specific examples or recommendations you might have.
- 11) The Probation Outcomes Study Group was charged to identify how agencies, communities and families can better prevent youth entry into the juvenile hall system. Provide insight on how to prevent youth who enter the juvenile justice system from reaching the point of being placed in out-of-home care and/or Probation camps. Provide direction on how to build an integrated and coordinated response system that would address the complex needs of youth and families, particularly those who penetrate deeply into the system. Identify key outcomes that can be measured consistently and regularly by Probation, LACOE and allied County departments.

Please explain the impetus for this Study.

- 12) Upon completion and publication of the results of this Study - to whom was it presented or communicated? Were the results presented to any citizen oversight bodies or the Board of Supervisors?
- 13) Were there any identifiable strategic or working plans developed in response to this study? If so, how are they implemented, evaluated and revised?
- 14) In Chapter 5 of the study a number of recommendations are proposed as a road map for the County of Los Angeles, the Probation Department, and allied agencies to develop and sustain an integrated system of best practices.
- 15) How do you envision the implementation of these recommendations?
- 16) Does the Study Group envision incorporating recommendations from the Study Group Outcomes Report into the Probation Department and allied agencies' strategic or working action plans?
- 17) Who would the Study Group propose provide oversight of the Probation Department and allied agencies to assure the development and sustainability of an integrated system of best practices demonstrated by data based outcomes?
- 18) What improvement or changes of oversight would the Study Group offer?
- 19) How is the work you are currently engaged in around county-wide visioning going to be translated into actual changes in the probation department? How is that connected to the study's core recommendations on improving data collection and understanding of youth outcomes? In other words, what will be done with the original recommendations?

- 20) Who has the authority to approve and adopt the recommendations from the study and this ongoing process? Is it for probation to take or leave?
- 21) How is your work intersecting with other probation change/reform efforts?
- 22) Does the countywide visioning encompass CBO work? Or is it centered around probation?